



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/524,143	02/11/2005	Volker Hennige	264612US0XPCT	2418
22850	7590	04/14/2008		
OBLON, SPIVAK, MCCLELLAND MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C. 1940 DUKE STREET ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314			EXAMINER RHEE, JANE J	
			ART UNIT 1795	PAPER NUMBER
			NOTIFICATION DATE 04/14/2008	DELIVERY MODE ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

patentdocket@oblon.com
oblonpat@oblon.com
jgardner@oblon.com

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/524,143

Applicant(s)

HENNINGE ET AL.

Examiner

JANE RHEE

Art Unit

1795

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 05 February 2008.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-25 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 13-23 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-12, 24-25 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/5508)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____

- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Rejection Repeated

1. The 35 U.S.C. Double patenting rejection of claims 1-12, 24-25 over copending application 10504144 in view of Omea et al. has been repeated as previously made in office action 11/16/07.
2. The 35 U.S.C. 103(a) rejection of claims 1-6,9-12,24-25 unpatentable over Yen in view of Omea et al. has been repeated as previously made in office action 11/16/07.
3. The 35 U.S.C. 103(a) rejection of claims 7-8 unpatentable over Yen in view of Omea et al. and in further view of Kung has been repeated as previously made in office action 11/16/07.

Response to Arguments

4. Applicant's arguments filed 2/5/08 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

In response to applicant's argument that Yen does not disclose a porous inorganic coating, Yen teaches inorganic fillers that are added as part of the encapsulation sheath to improve the wettability of the nonwoven thus the inorganic fillers are considered the inorganic coating because the inorganic fillers is on and in the nonwoven material as desired by applicant's claim 1.

In response to applicant's argument that there is no suggestion to combine the references, the examiner recognizes that obviousness can only be established by combining or modifying the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention where there is some teaching, suggestion, or motivation to do so found either in the

Art Unit: 1795

references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art. See *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988) and *In re Jones*, 958 F.2d 347, 21 USPQ2d 1941 (Fed. Cir. 1992). In this case, Yen teaches a wettable non woven battery separator and Omae et al. teaches a nonwoven battery separator that is excellent in liquid retaining and absorbing characteristics with pore radius of 25-100um. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time applicant's invention was made to provide, Yen with a separator comprising a pore radius of 25-100um in order to be excellent in solution retention and absorbency as taught by Omae et al. Both Yen and Omae et al. teaches same nonwoven separator material for the secondary batteries, therefore, it would have been obvious to provide the same separator material with optimal pore radius taught by Omae et al. in order to provide Yen with a separator comprising optimal results.

In response to applicant's argument that there is no suggestion to combine the references, the examiner recognizes that obviousness can only be established by combining or modifying the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention where there is some teaching, suggestion, or motivation to do so found either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art. See *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988) and *In re Jones*, 958 F.2d 347, 21 USPQ2d 1941 (Fed. Cir. 1992). In this case, Yen teaches a wettable non woven battery separator and Kung teaches a wettable nonwoven separator. Yen teaches organic fillers in the nonwoven separator and Kung teaches organic fillers in the nonwoven separator. Yen fail to teach the particle size of the

organic fillers and Kung teaches oxide particles having the desired average particle size for the purpose of providing a separator that is excellent in tensile strength, wicking properties, wettability and alkali resistance (col. 2 lines 3-4). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time applicant's invention was made to provide, Yen with oxide particles having the desired average particle size from 0.5 to 7 μm in order to provide a separator that is excellent in tensile strength, wicking properties, wettability and alkali resistance (col. 2 lines 3-4) as taught by Kung.

In response to the arguments concerning the double patenting rejection wherein Omae et al. does not that the pore size disclosed have any applicability in the battery separator claimed, both Yen and Omae et al. teaches same nonwoven separator material for the secondary batteries, therefore, it would have been obvious to provide the same separator material with optimal pore radius taught by Omae et al. in order to provide Yen with a separator comprising optimal results such as being excellent in liquid retaining and absorbing characteristics.

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any

Art Unit: 1795

extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to JANE RHEE whose telephone number is (571)272-1499. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 9-6.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Patrick Ryan can be reached on 571-272-1292. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Jane Rhee/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1795
4/3/08

